

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 6-7, 11 and 12 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 6-7, 11 and 12 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 6, 11, and 12 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the clarifying preposition "to" as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 6, 7, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by over U.S. Patent No. 6,005,869 to Sakai et al. (Sakai). Applicant traverses the rejection via amendment and argument.

Claims 6, 11 and 12 are amended to clarify that the second table storing a sequence defines a chronological order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth. This conforms to the tables of Figure 1 where the nodes A, B, C and D reserve a fraction of the bandwidth as indicated in table 2 of Figure 1. Table 3 is then constructed. From the Figure 1 and the description, it is clear that if a node doesn't reserve a fraction of the bandwidth, the node doesn't appear in Table 3 of Figure 1.

As indicated in response to the previous communication, Applicant respectfully reiterates that Sakai does not disclose a master node that transmits to each node a second table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between the nodes of the network, and wherein each node transmits the token to a next node in the sequence in parallel such that each node of the network follows circulation of the token.

Applicant notes that Sakai does disclose a master node that creates and stores a first table with, for each node of the network, information indicative of communication management information for each node (See in Sakai, the token packet management table 1502 in col. 32 line 3 and col. 22 line 59 to col. 23 line 3). But, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakai does not disclose a master that constructs and transmits to each node a second table storing the sequence defining the order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth as recited in the pending claims.

In Sakai, the bus is a ring shaped bus, where a token circulates in the same direction in the loop, where the master station sends out one token packet at a time corresponding to the next token number such that all nodes receive the token in turn. This is illustrated in Sakai col. 26 line 65 to col. 27 line 14. In the present application, the token circulates in a different order and only between the nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth, as illustrated in the tables of Figure 1.

Since Sakai does not discuss the aspect of a second table storing a sequence that defines a chronological order of passage of the token between nodes that reserved a fraction of bandwidth, then Sakai cannot anticipate the pending amended claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 per MPEP §2131. Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of pending Claims 6, 7, 11, and 12 these claims patentably define over the cited art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration for a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims based on the amendments and arguments presented above.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean-François Fleury et al.

Date: November 2, 2009

/Jerome G. Schaefer/
Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,800
(609) 734-6451

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312